UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.        | FILING DATE                 | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR   | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/597,363             | 07/25/2008                  | Robert Bruce Nicholson | GB920030112US1      | 9883             |
| 49132<br>HARRINGTON    | 7590 04/27/201<br>N & SMITH | EXAMINER               |                     |                  |
| 4 RESEARCH             | DRIVE, Suite 202            | WONG, TITUS            |                     |                  |
| SHELTON, CT 06484-6212 |                             |                        | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                        |                             |                        | 2184                |                  |
|                        |                             |                        |                     |                  |
|                        |                             |                        | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                        |                             |                        | 04/27/2011          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)     |
|-----------------|------------------|
| 10/597,363      | NICHOLSON ET AL. |
| Examiner        | Art Unit         |
| TITUS WONG      | 2184             |

| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the c   | over sheet with the correspondence address   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| THE REPLY FILED 14 April 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN  | CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.   |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same da application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) at application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The   | amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the al fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request  |  |  |  |  |
| periods:  | A control of the cont |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the fir   | •  |  |  |  |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX N  | ONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  |  |  |  |  |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHE MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, |  |  |  |  |  |
| may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 3 filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time AMENDMENTS   | (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since   |  |  |  |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to th (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration as   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for a approach and/or</li> </ul>   | opeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for   |  |  |  |  |
| appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding   |  |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33   | • • •  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attac  | ned Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below on The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>22-32 and 34-51</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  See Continuation Sheet.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Other:  |  |  |  |  |  |
| /Henry W.H. Tsai/   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2184  |  |  |  |  |  |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: New issues such as: "...a storage controller operates as a back-up storage controller..." (in claims 22, 34, and 42).

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed on 4/14/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argued "Ito'600 fails to teach operating as a backup storage controller configured by..." (Page 11 of Amendment) Examiner does not agree with Applicants. As mentioned in the previous office action, "configurable" indicates that the storage controller may or may not be configured as a back-up storage controller performing the associating, etc. Examiner interpreted that the storage controller is not configured as a back-up storage controller and thus is not associating all ports of the storage controller and selecting the named set. Although, it may seem that amending the term "configurable" to recite "operates" is a simple change, but in fact the scope of the claim has changed greatly. The limitations of "...associating all ports of the storage controller in all named sets and by selecting which named set that the logical units of the storage controller are associated with" under the current amendment will have to be fully reconsidered. There were other similar amendments made that also changed the scope of the claims. Therefore, further consideration and/or a new search is required.